UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,256	01/26/2004	Srikanth Varanasi	1-15610	9581
	7590 04/08/200 & MELHORN, LLC		EXAMINER	
FOUR SEAGA	TE - EIGHTĤ FLOOI		CHEN, BRET P	
TOLEDO, OH 43604			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1792	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/08/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/765,256	VARANASI ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	BRET CHEN	1792
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ Th Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	nis action is non-final. vance except for formal matters, pre	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-14,16-20 and 27-29 is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-14, 16-20, 27-29 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	rawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) according a constant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the correctio	ccepted or b) objected to by the e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ection is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ejected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat iority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	ate

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-14, 16-20, 27-29 are pending in this application. Amended claims 6 and 16 are noted.

The amendment dated 12/20/07 has been entered and carefully considered. The examiner appreciates the amendments to the claims. In view of said amendment, the 112 rejection has been withdrawn. In addition, in view of the applicant's arguments on p.7, the previous art rejection has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-14, 16-20, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halaby et al. (3,892,888) in view of Robinson et al. (2002/0135099) or vice versa.

Halaby discloses a method of making a magnetite film or gamma ferric oxide film magnetic recording and storage device comprising the step of depositing a film of elemental iron, alpha ferric oxide, or magnetite on an inorganic and non-magnetic substrate by chemical vapor deposition (col.1 lines 36-49). The substrate can be in the form of a disk, tape, rod, drum or wire and can be aluminum, glass, glass-ceramic or ceramic that can withstand without damage the high temperatures encountered in the method of this invention (col.2 lines 15-23) and can be heated to 300°C (col.2 lines 52-54). The precursor can be ferrocene and can be transported by the use of an inert or reducing carrier gas (col.2 lines 54-69) and the carrier gas can be oxygen (col.6 lines 1-18). It should be noted that the final film can be alpha ferric oxide (col.5 lines 63-

65). Nitrogen can be used as an inert gas (col.4 lines 1-25). However, the reference fails to

teach a float glass process.

Robinson discloses a method of using float glass having a SnO.sub.2 enriched surface, wherein the method includes the steps of providing an ionic release agent externally to the tin oxide surface (par 9). Specifically, the reference teaches the conventionality of making a float glass wherein the molten glass is allowed to float on a liquid pool of tin which results in one side of the glass having a tin enriched surface as opposed to the air-side of that same piece of glass (par 54). A metal oxide coating such as Fe₂O₃ can be formed (par 55). In one embodiment, two or more layers are contemplated (par 55). It would have been obvious to incorporate the float glass substrate of Robinson in Halaby's process with the expectation of obtaining similar results.

In addition, Robinson's process is silent on specific precursors for forming Fe₂O₃ layers. Halaby discloses the conventionality of using ferrocene and an oxidant. It would have been obvious to incorporate Halaby's precursors in Robinson's process with the expectation of success.

With respect to the gas precursor mixture, it is noted that the claim specifically recites "directing ferrocene and an oxidant toward and along the surface to be coated to form a gaseous precursor mixture". Since Halaby specifically teaches of forming a ferric oxide film by reacting ferrocene and oxygen as noted above, one skilled in the art would realize that the gases mixed in some sort of fashion.

The limitations of claims 2-3, 13 have been addressed above.

In claim 4, the applicant requires a cooling step. Eventually the final product will be cooled to room temperature thus meeting the limitation.

In claim 5, the applicant requires a specific inert carrier gas such as nitrogen. This limitation is met in col.4 lines 8-9.

In claim 6, the applicant requires a specific deposition rate. Halaby teaches a similar deposition rate in col.3 lines 1-36. Regardless, it would have been obvious to have a fast deposition rate with the expectation of improving deposition efficiency.

In claims 7-12, the applicant requires a specific concentration. Halaby teaches a similar concentration in col.4 line 1 - col.5 line 7. Regardless, it is well known to vary composition to optimize the characteristics of the final product and hence, would have been obvious to vary the composition do with the expectation of obtaining the desired final properties.

In claim 14, the applicant requires dissolving ferrocene in a solvent. Halaby teaches of dissolving ferrocene in benzene (col.2 lines 66-67) and thus meets the limitation of the claim.

In claim 16, the applicant requires an additional coating. This is met in col.7 lines 1-52. The limitations of claims 17-20 and 29 have been addressed above.

Claims 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halaby et al. (3,892,888) in view of Robinson et al. (2002/0135099) or vice versa and further in view of Higby (5,780,372). The combination of Halaby and Robinson disclose a method of forming a ferric oxide film on a glass substrate using ferrocene as note above. However, the references fail to teach the use of iron oxide coatings in architectural glazings.

Higby teaches the conventionality of using iron oxide in architectural glazings. It would have been obvious to utilize the coating produced by the combination of Halaby and Robinson for architectural glazings because Higby teaches the conventionality of doing same.

Application/Control Number: 10/765,256 Page 5

Art Unit: 1792

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. A new ground(s) of rejection is offered.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRET CHEN whose telephone number is (571)272-1417. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on (571) 272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/B. Chen/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792 3/30/08